



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,788	10/29/2003	Howard A. Baumer	1875.3640001	6066
26111	7590	10/07/2004	EXAMINER	
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			BOAKYE, ALEXANDER O	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2667	

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/694,788

Applicant(s)

BAUMER, HOWARD A.

Examiner

ALEXANDER BOAKYE

Art Unit

2667

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 9, 11 and 17-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-8 and 12-16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Applicant is required to provide the serial numbers of co-pending application cited at pages 11 and 12 of the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification fails to teach the configuration block recited in claim 25.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 9, 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Terada et al. (4,833,605).

Regarding claim 1, Terada teaches a transceiver (Figs. 1 and 2), comprising: multiple parallel ports (column 4, lines 35-36; see Figs. 1 and 2); multiple serial ports

(column 5, lines 9-10); and a bus connecting the multiple parallel ports and the multiple serial ports on a common substrate with the multiple parallel ports and the multiple serial ports (column 5, lines 15-21 ; column 5, lines 42-49 ; the claimed common substrate reads on computer chip).

Regarding claim 9, Terada teaches that the bus is a parallel bus (see Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 11, Terada teaches that each of the serial ports include a serial to-parallel converter, a parallel port of the serial-to-parallel converter connected to the parallel bus (column 5, lines 9-27).

Regarding claim 17, Terada teaches that data clock rates of the serial data ports and the parallel data ports are programmable (column 4, lines 7-11).

Regarding claims 18, 19, 20, 24, Terada teaches that the multiple serial data ports and the multiple parallel data ports can be enabled and disabled to provide a specific configuration for the transceiver (column 6, lines 27-38; column 6, lines 27-41).

Regarding claim 21, Terada teaches that at least one of the multiple parallel ports is enabled (column 6, lines 27-38).

Regarding claim 22, Terada teaches that at least one of the multiple parallel port is disabled (column 6, lines 27-41).

Regarding claim 23, Terada teaches that at least one custom logic block connected to the bus (see Fig. 22).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2667

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terada et al. (US Patent # 4,833,605)

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Terada teaches a transceiver (see Fig. 2). Terada does not explicitly disclose that the bus is configured to have a ring shape. However, Terada teaches daisy chain data transfer (column 6, lines 53-56). One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to configure a bus to have a ring shape since daisy chain can form a ring when the loop is closed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a daisy chain as taught by Terada in a ring shape with the motivation being that it provides capability for the system to transmit data from adjacent port to another adjacent port over the bus.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10,12-16, objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 25 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2667

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Boakye whose telephone number is (571) 272-3183. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30am to 6:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham , can be reached on (571) 272-3179. The fax number is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Alexander Boakye

Patent Examiner

AB

9/30/04


CHI PHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 10/1/04